

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 191

RC 011 010

AUTHOR Moore, Dan E.
TITLE Population Change Within Nonmetropolitan and Metropolitan Areas: Lessons from New York State.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 30p.; Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (San Francisco, California, August 30-September 3, 1978); Not available in hard copy due to author's preference

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Census Figures; *Demography; Geographic Distribution; Local Government; *Metropolitan Areas; Migration Patterns; Policy Formation; Population Growth; *Population Trends; *Rural Population; Urban Population; *Urban to Rural Migration

IDENTIFIERS Metro Sprawl Thesis; *New York; *Nonmetropolitan Population

ABSTRACT

According to the results of an in-depth study of the process of population change in New York State, the less densely settled an area, the more likely it is to grow in the 1970's. This is more evidence of the recent major U.S. demographic phenomenon of a revival of population growth in non-metropolitan areas. Population data for the sixty-two counties in New York provide a comparison of metropolitan and non-metropolitan area population changes, a history of such changes back to 1900, and an examination of population changes within the metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas. Various census population estimates for 1975 and 1976 provide data for further comparisons. Regardless of which estimate is selected for analysis, the greatest population loss occurs in New York City and the greatest gain in the least urbanized, non-metropolitan areas. Commuting data gives a direct indication of "metro sprawl". Small units of government need to be prepared to deal with certain aspects of population growth: federal programs have historically ignored small units of government; decisions will probably have to be made concerning annexation or incorporation; it may be necessary to identify incoming migrants and how they affect the existing population composition; and care must be exercised in developing policy based on aggregate data (e.g., there may be an overall decline, statewide, in school age population but a locally heavy increase in student numbers). (SB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Prepared for presentation at the annual meeting
of the Rural Sociological Society, August 30-September 3, 1978
San Francisco, California.

2

Population Change Within Nonmetropolitan and
Metropolitan Areas: Lessons from New York State

One of the major demographic phenomena in the United States in recent years has been the revival of population growth in nonmetropolitan areas. This growth is largely a result of the reversal of the migration pattern which saw millions of Americans move from rural to urban areas. Now the predominant migration stream appears to be from metropolitan to nonmetropolitan areas. The national trend has been documented (Beale, 1975), as well as its pervasiveness in various regions of the country (Beale and Fuguitt, 1975). The purpose of this paper is to explore in depth the process of population change in New York State

While studying the 18 million people in New York is justified in its own right, there may be lessons with wider applicability. In many respects the state is a bellwether. After Rhode Island in 1860, New York in 1870, was the second state in the U. S. to become predominately urban. And, ironically, in 1975 New York and Rhode Island were the only states to show an absolute decline in population. New York, the epitome of the urban industrial state, was first into the recession of 1974 and is now the only state to fail to reach its pre-recession private jobs total (New York Times:39). The fiscal condition of the state is well known to students of both urban affairs and higher education. Perhaps it is not mistaken to give this state careful study.

More specifically, I have two major objectives in the following. The first is to outline the changes in New York State's population focusing on the metropolitan-nonmetropolitan distinction, and to trace these changes back to 1900. The second objective is to examine where growth or decline has taken place within nonmetro and metro areas. Is it in the large cities, small

cities, villages, or open country? Subsidiary objectives are to compare the various census population estimates for 1975 and 1976, to use commuting data as a basis for categorizing nonmetro counties, and to briefly discuss the implications of nonmetropolitan growth.

DATA AND PROCEDURES

The U. S. Bureau of the Census was the primary source of data for the analysis. For the years through 1970 the number of inhabitants in each county was taken from the decennial census. The net migration data for the 1950-60 decade were taken from Bowles and Tarver (1965) and for the 1960-70 decade from Bowles, Beale, and Lee (1975).

The post-1970 population estimates are made by the U. S. Bureau of the Census annually and published in the Current Population Reports. The majority of the analysis is based on two publications. The first is the provisional estimates for 1975 for each county and metropolitan area (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1976). The quality of these estimates has been discussed elsewhere (Beale and Fuguitt, 1975; Beale, 1975). Suffice it to say, they are the best available. The second publication is the 1975 population estimates for counties and minor civil divisions (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1977b). These data are also referred to as the "revenue sharing" estimates since their development was prompted by the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972. Estimates for small areas are very difficult, and are generally unreliable for any specific area. However, use of these data seem justified here for two reasons. First, smaller areas are aggregated within categories of counties so as to minimize inaccuracies for individual places. Second, even if they are in error, the estimates are real in their consequences since they serve as the basis for distributing revenue sharing monies.

The 62 counties in New York State are the basic units of analysis. The 1974 definition of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas was used throughout to categorize counties into metropolitan and nonmetropolitan. The 31 metropolitan counties were further subdivided into four categories. First, the 5 counties or boroughs of New York City were combined. Second, the five counties of Putnam, Rockland, Westchester, Nassau and Suffolk were considered as New York City Suburban counties. The first three are officially considered part of the New York City SMSA. Even though Nassau and Suffolk are considered an SMSA in their own right, they are integrally tied to New York City. New York City (7.6 million) and these five suburban counties (3.8 million) constitute over 70 percent of the metropolitan population of the state and almost 63 percent of the state's total population.

The remaining metropolitan population is divided into the metro core and metro fringe. The core is made up of counties containing SMSA central cities of over 50,000 inhabitants. (Niagra County is included as core because the city of Niagra Falls is over 50,000 population even though the county is also a part of the Buffalo SMSA.) The fringe includes all other counties classified as metropolitan.

Beale and others have divided nonmetropolitan counties into those adjacent to SMSAs and those non-adjacent. This distinction has very little meaning in New York since there are very few non-adjacent counties.¹ The reason for the distinction was to ascertain whether nonmetropolitan growth was solely a result of metropolitan sprawl. This possibility will be examined below using commuting data as an indicator of linkage to the SMSA.

Previous researchers have also separated nonmetro counties on the basis of the size of the largest place in the county. The rationale has been that counties with a relatively large urban center could be undergoing a

kind of mini urbanization process as opposed to truly "rural" growth (Beale and Fuguitt, 1975:6). In the following analysis the 31 nonmetro counties are grouped using this logic. There are 15 nonmetro counties where the largest place in the county was over 10,000. There are 16 where the size of the largest place was less than 10,000 in 1970.

In every instance below where a rate of change is discussed, it is presented as an annual rate of change to facilitate comparisons between the 10 year intercensal periods and the 5 1/4 years from April 1, 1970 and July 1, 1975 (Beale and Fuguitt, 1975:31).

NEW YORK POPULATION CHANGE IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

In order to put New York's plight in context, Table 1 not only includes annual rates of change for census periods from 1900 to 1975, but also presents data for the U. S. and the various regions of the country. The .9 percent annual growth rate for the U. S. in 1970-75 is the lowest since the depression years and implies the relatively recent drop in the birthrate. However, the U. S. rate masks dramatic regional differences. The differences in population growth rate between the South and West on the one hand and the Northeast and to a lesser extent the North Central on the other represent but one aspect of what one pundit has called the "second war between the states." New York State is a clear loser in this numbers game. Since the 1920's New York's growth rate has been lower than the nation's, but it has never been negative.

The bottom half of Table 1 illustrates how misleading the single state figure can be. While the metropolitan counties are, in the aggregate, losing almost .3 percent per year (-.26) since 1970, the nonmetro areas at almost one percent (.99) per year, are growing at the highest rate since before the turn of the century.² And the 1970-75 period is the first in

which the nonmetro growth rate is higher than the metro.

Has a "turnaround" occurred in the nonmetropolitan counties? Not in the sense of changing from decline to growth. If there was a "turnaround" in these nonmetro counties it occurred sometime between 1910 and 1930. The growth has been slow but steady ever since.

If a reversal is evident in the 1970's it occurred in New York City and the other metro core counties. The city experienced a slight decline in the 1950-60 decade but note that this drop was coupled with a most dramatic 5.44 annual percent increase in its suburbs. In this 1970-75 period the NYC suburbs showed just as dramatic a drop-off to only .41 percent per year, while the city was losing .8 of a percent per year.

The metro core counties were also losing population. The only significant growth in the metropolitan counties was occurring in the fringe counties, and this rate of 1.07 represented approximately a one-third decrease from the two previous decades.

The overall nonmetro rate of .99 is somewhat less than the 1.35 for total U. S. nonmetro areas for the period 1970-73 (Beale and Fuguitt, 1975:22). However, it is important to note that 29 of the 31 nonmetro counties were growing, and the two counties with losses, actually lost very little.

Perhaps a more vivid, if closely related, way to compare the differences between metro and nonmetro areas is to look at net migration patterns. Table 2 shows that in the 1950-60 decade there was a net in-migration to all metro areas except New York City. The NYC suburbs gained the most people, many of whom probably came from the city. During the period 1970-75 the state was losing over half a million people, most from New York City but also 120,000 from other metro core counties. But for the first time there was a net in-migration to nonmetro areas. Thus even though New York was making history by losing population as a state, the nonmetro areas were demonstrating a period of growth which paralleled the national nonmetro trend.

The last line in Table 2 suggests that the highest rate of in-migration was occurring in the most rural counties.

THE METRO SPRAWL THESIS: ANOTHER TEST

Beale (1975;1976) notes that one of the most frequent reactions of those skeptical of a revival of nonmetro growth is that the growth is merely an outward geographical expansion of the more well known phenomena of metropolitanization. Beale and others have effectively demonstrated that even though nonmetro counties adjacent to metro areas are growing faster than those not adjacent, the nonmetro, not adjacent areas are growing faster than the metro. In fact the four nonadjacent, nonmetro counties in New York State are growing faster than any other grouping of counties. But the relatively small base of population might lead the skeptic to persist in this case.

As a more direct test of the "sprawl thesis" I have classified the nonmetro counties by the percent of the labor force in 1970 which commuted to an SMSA county to work.³ This seems a direct measure of what is meant by sprawl or suburbanization: live in the country but go to the city for work, major shopping, etc.

Table 3 shows that the annual growth rates for the counties with over 20 percent of the labor force commuting to a SMSA is not different from the rate for those with less than 3 percent commuting. While the rate has gone up in both of the extreme categories, the increase has been greater for those least tied to metro areas. The 1.31 annual rate for the 11 to 20 percent category is the highest of any category of counties in the 1970-75 period. However, note that this rate is a decrease over previous decades. The obvious point in Table 3 is the same as Beale has made elsewhere: the issue of metro expansion is not an either/or situation. There is growth in areas proximate to SMSAs. But there is also growth,

new and unexpected, in the more remote, rural areas.

COMPARISON OF POPULATION ESTIMATES

To this point in the analysis, the population figures for 1975 were the "provisional" estimates published in 1976. Since these data were published two more recent census estimates have become available. The estimates for counties and minor civil divisions, referred to above as the "revenue sharing" estimates were published in May, 1977. These data were used in research reported in the next section. In addition, the "revised" 1975 estimates and the "provisional" estimates for 1976 were published in August 1977. Table 4 shows a comparison of the four estimates for the state and categories of countries. The 1975 provisional estimate appears to be the most conservative in that the declines are less and the increases more modest. The revenue sharing and the 1975 revised estimates are slightly more extreme. However, the pattern of growth and decline is consistent. No matter which estimate is selected, the greatest loss of population occurs in New York City and the greatest gain is in the least urbanized nonmetro category (with the minor exception of the metro fringe in the 1975 provisional).

I chose to present the 1975 provisional above since these included 1975 migration estimates. Thus all estimates, including the revenue sharing, referred to 1975. The other alternative, to use the 1976 provisional, would not have permitted this. (However, analyses were carried out using the 1976 provisional with no difference in the pattern of findings.)

POPULATION CHANGE WITHIN NONMETRO AND WITHIN METRO AREAS

Until recently it was the large, urbanized areas which attracted migrants and grew, while the remote, rural areas produced the migrants and, even with a higher birthrate than the cities, declined in population.

Beale (1976:956) states it this way:

One of the most interesting and significant aspects of the recent trend is the complete shambles that it has made of the former strongly positive association between density of population and growth Here is convincing, even startling, evidence of a rapid shift down the scale of residence that involves the most remote, least settled, and least urbanized parts of the country.

We saw in Table 1 that this shift has occurred in New York State. In 1975, the most rapidly growing counties were either nonmetro with no city over 10,000 or metro fringe with no city over 50,000. Next were the nonmetro with a larger city, then the small metro and finally New York City. The pattern of growth changes in this state anticipated national trends in that one must go back to the 1930's and 1940's to find the complete reverse or a "strongly positive association between density and growth."

This finding is true when county is used as unit of analysis, but does it hold within counties? Are the more rural or least urbanized areas within metro areas growing more rapidly? Beale (1976:956) suggests that evidence derived from the 1973 revenue sharing estimates show areas outside of cities over 10,000 growing more rapidly than cities.

Table 5 and 6 present data for the five categories of New York counties analyzed above. Within each category of counties the population in cities over 10,000 is aggregated, then the population in cities and villages 2500 to 10000 is aggregated, etc. In this analysis I have considered as "incorporated places" all cities and villages. Towns, or townships as they are known in other states, are considered as "unincorporated" areas, even though all areas are technically incorporated under New York State Law.

Table 5 shows that no matter whether the population in places over 10000 is in metro core counties, or in metro fringe counties or in the New York City suburbs, the total population declined between 1970 and 1975. In the metro fringe the rate of decline (-.10) is less than between 1960 and 1970 (-.61).

In the other two categories the decline is greater in the more recent period.

Generally for 1970-75, the smaller the place, the greater the growth. The pattern for 1960-70 is much the same, although in these metropolitan counties the rates of growth were higher in this earlier period. The major exception is that small and medium-sized places were growing in the metro fringe counties.

The pattern which emerges in Table 6 for nonmetropolitan counties is even clearer. When considering only those counties with no places over 10,000, and as one moves from larger places (2500-10,000) to small places (under 2500), then to incorporated areas, the annual rate of growth increases monotonically. Moreover, in all three categories of place size, the rate is higher for 1970-75 than for 1960-70.

For the nonmetro counties with a place over 10,000, the pattern is just as systematic within each period. However, for the unincorporated areas the growth rate is slightly higher in the 1960's. In general, the trend is just as Beale described it. The less densely settled an area, the more likely it is to grow in the 1970's.

Since the 1970-75 data are estimates and not census counts, a certain caution is in order in drawing conclusions for small areas, even though the areas are aggregated. Special studies by the Census Bureau have shown that, in general, the estimating procedures are not biased. However, there is some evidence that estimates for small units have a "slight positive directional bias." Until counts are available, we will have to view these findings as tentative. It should be noted though that there is evidence that this new pattern began to emerge during the 60's in New York State.

MEANINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

The previous research on the nonmetropolitan revival has been supported by this analysis of population change in New York State. The magnitude of

decline in metro areas and of growth in nonmetro areas has been more modest than in some other regions. However, the direction of change has been similar, and, in some instances, the changes in the patterns in New York presaged the recent more dramatic events by a number of decades.

The use of commuting data gave a direct indication of pre-suburban metro status, commonly referred to as metro sprawl. While there is some evidence of counties with a high percent of labor force commuting to SMSA's showing relatively high growth rates, there is also comparable evidence for growth in more remote areas.

Using 1975 population estimates for minor civil divisions this analysis demonstrated a systematic negative relationship between size of place (and by implication, density) and rate of recent population growth. This finding has important policy implications since the places which are growing may be least prepared to deal with this growth. The leadership is not experienced and the infrastructure, such as community facilities, is not present. What is more, all this is happening at a time when the nation and some states, particularly New York State, are taking steps to deal with stability, even decline.

In the past, federal government programs have not been geared for the nonmetro areas, and particularly small units of government. In other research on New York villages I found that smaller villages were less likely than larger ones to have received any federal dollars during the 1960's (Moore, 1977) and, indeed, the absolute number of villages receiving federal aid decreased during the decade and was the lowest of any year in 1970. As these smaller places undergo changing demands for services, in general they will not have had experience with extra local funding sources that could facilitate such accommodation.

Two techniques for altering political structures to deal with change are annexation and incorporation. Neither are particularly appropriate in the New York case nor perhaps in others. In some areas of the country when population growth and corresponding development occur on the outskirts of a city or village, the appropriate municipality simply annexes the area. This accomplishes two things. First, the value of the property is captured by the tax rolls of the municipality. Second, if services such as sewer and water are available, they are more likely to be found inside the municipality rather than outside, thus facilitating the provision of services to new residents. However, in New York the state laws make annexation difficult, if not impossible. Furthermore, the above analysis showed that growth is occurring away from major urban areas which in other places and times have done the annexing. A similar situation exists in New York State with regard to the incorporation of formerly rural areas into cities or villages. Incorporation, like annexation, is a complex and lengthy process. The law in effect discourages it. For example, there are special taxing limitations for incorporated villages which mitigate against their formation (Temporary State Commission, 1973). Dealing with changes certainly requires effort by local communities, but it also requires the careful attention of state or other extra-local agencies which control access to accommodation techniques such as annexation and incorporation.

Intimately related to the issue of where population growth (or decline) occurs in nonmetro areas is the question of just who the migrants are and how they affect the population composition of the areas. For example, Fox and Sullivan (1978) have shown that rates of change in local government expenditures during the 1960-70 decade in growing versus declining counties varied depending upon the socioeconomic characteristics of the population. It is too soon for comprehensive studies of the characteristics of the most

recent migrants. However, there are suggestive reports focusing on migrants to nonmetro areas in the late 60's (DeJong and Humphrey, 1976; Voss and Fuguitt, 1977). In these studies metro to nonmetro migrants are not only much younger and of higher socioeconomic status than nonmetro nonmigrants (stayers), but they are also significantly younger and of higher SES when compared to those in the counter stream from nonmetro to metro. These new arrivals to nonmetro areas would appear to have the financial clout and the knowledge to effectively confront existing community organizations. A next important part of the research agenda on the revival of growth in nonmetropolitan areas is to study in some depth the relationship among recent migrants, local residents and their shared community. Ploch (1977) has made an important contribution in this area.

A major caution for the policymaker, the community development practitioner, and the citizen emerges from this analysis: One ought not to apply generalizations developed from aggregate data uncritically to particular subareas or communities. Even though New York was relatively unique in its overall population decline since 1970, the nonmetropolitan areas were increasing in population. And within those nonmetro areas, large cities were declining. Yet, even here some nonmetro large cities were growing. Policy at the national and state levels must consider those variations. Similarly, the local officials need to be aware of the correspondence between state and regional trends, on the one hand, and the local situation, on the other. Klay (1978) has found that county commissioners in Florida are likely to base perceptions of local changes in population on state-wide trends. However this resulted in some errors in adjudging the local situation especially with respect to the components of population change--net migration versus mutual increase. The local officials apparently get more information about state than local changes since most of the media sources were regional or state-wide in scope. I would predict that the possibility for mis-information

is greater in states like New York or Pennsylvania where there is more variability in population changes among counties. In Florida the commissioners overwhelmingly said their counties were growing. In fact most counties were growing as was the state as a whole.

The necessity to base decisions on current and correct information seems obvious. And yet one can cite numerous instances of failure to do so. The current lack of preparedness for declining school enrollments is but one example. Even in this instance the school district official dare not plan solely on the basis of state-wide predictions of the changing student pool. The total number of students in New York State of school age may in fact decline by over 20 percent between 1970 and 1980 (Morrison, 1977). Yet the small nonmetro district which in the past has had a stable or declining number of students may in fact find the situation "turned around." This school board along with other local agencies may have to deal with unprecedented growth.

NOTES

1. There are a number of quirks of geography which keep more counties from being "non-adjacent." Some counties have only a miniscule proportion of their borders in contact with SMSA counties.
2. A 1974 definition of metropolitan areas is used consistently and is projected back into earlier decades. In some respects this is misleading. Some counties classified as metropolitan by this definition probably had no characteristics of such areas in earlier decades. However, the nonmetro areas in 1974 were probably also very rural in earlier periods so this comparison seems more valid. Similarly, New York City and the metro core counties have a conceptual continuity.
3. I am indebted to Peter A. Morrison of the Rand Corporation for the data on commuting. The data were originally prepared by Richard L. Forstall of the U. S. Bureau of the Census.
4. For example, the displacement from farms which is one factor in nonmetro to metro migration (Beale, 1977:40) was at its height in the earlier part of this century and corresponds roughly to the decline of nonmetro areas observed in Table 1 during the 1920's and 30's.

REFERENCES

- Beale, Calvin L.
1975 "The Revival of Population Growth in Nonmetropolitan America,"
Washington, D. C.: USDA, June.
- 1976 "A Further Look at Nonmetropolitan Population Growth Since 1970."
American Journal of Agricultural Economics 58 (December): 953-958.
- 1977 "Comments on Peter A. Morrison, 'New York State's Transition to
Stability.'" In the Decline of New York in the 1970's, proceedings
of a conference held by the Center for Social Analysis, State
University of New York at Binghamton.
- Beale, Calvin L., and Glenn V. Fuguitt
1975 "The New Pattern of Nonmetropolitan Population Change." Madison,
Wisconsin: Center for Demography and Ecology, Working Paper 75-22.
- Bowles, Gladys K., Calvin L. Beale, and Everett S. Lee
1975 Net Migration of the Population, 1960-70, by Age, Sex, and Color.
USDA-ERS, University of Georgia, and National Science Foundation.
- Bowles, Gladys K., and James D. Tarver
1965 Net Migration of the Population, 1950-60, By Age, Sex, and Color.
Volume I. USDA-ERS, Oklahoma State University Research Foundation
and U. S. Department of Commerce.
- DeJong, Gordon F., and Craig R. Humphrey
1976 "Selected Characteristics of Metropolitan-to-Nonmetropolitan Area
Migrants: A Study of Population Redistribution in Pennsylvania."
Rural Sociology 41 (Winter):526-537.
- Fox, William F., and Patrick J. Sullivan
1978 "Fiscal Impacts of Changes in Population for Nonmetropolitan
Areas of the Northeast." Journal of the Northeastern Agricultural
Economics Council VII (April):41-46.
- Fuguitt, Glenn V., and James J. Zuiches
1975 "Residential References and Population Distribution." Demography 12
(August):491-504.
- Klay, William Earle
1978 "Demographic Knowledge of Local Officials: Misperceptions of
Population Change." Journal of Community Development Society of
America 9 (Spring):90-96.
- Moore, Dan E.
1977 "Federal Revenues in New York Villages, 1960-1970. Paper presented
at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Madison,
Wisconsin.

Morrison, Peter A.

- 1977 "New York's Transition to Stability: The Demographic Outlook. In The Decline of New York in the 1970's, proceeding of a conference held by the Center for Social Analysis, State University of New York at Binghamton.

New York Times

- 1978 "New York Held Only State to Fail to Regain Job Loss." Sunday, March 28:39.

Ploch, Louis A.

- 1977 "The Reversal in Migration Patterns: Some Rural Development Consequences." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Madison, Wisconsin.

Temporary State Commission on the Powers of Local Government

- 1973 Strengthening local government in New York: Part 1, The capacity for change. State of New York.

U. S. Bureau of the Census

- 1976 "Estimates of the population of New York counties and metropolitan areas, July 1, 1974 and 1975." Current Population Reports, P-25, No. 631.
- 1977a "Estimates of the population of states, by age: July 1, 1975 and 1976." Current Population Reports, P-25, No. 646.
- 1977b "1973 (Revised) and 1975 Population Estimates and 1972 (Revised) and 1974 per capita income estimates for counties, incorporated places, and selected minor civil division in New York." Current Population Reports, P-25, No. 680.
- 1977c "Estimates of the population of New York counties and metropolitan areas: July 1, 1975 and 1976. Current Population Reports, P-26, No. 76-32.

Voss, Paul R., and Glenn V. Fuguitt

- 1977 "Migrant characteristics of a 'turnaround' area: 1965-1970 immigration to a 45-county subarea of the Upper Great Lakes." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Madison, Wisconsin.

Table 1. Annual Rates of Population Change for the United States,
Regions of the U. S., New York State and Regions of New York

	Annual rate of population change								1975 Total Population	(Number of Counties)
	1900- 1910	1910- 1920	1920- 1930	1930- 1940	1940- 1950	1950- 1960	1960- 1970	1970- 1975		
United States	1.90	1.39	1.50	.70	1.35	1.69	1.25	.90	213,121,000	
North Central	1.26	1.29	1.26	.39	1.02	1.49	.92	.36	57,669,000	
South	1.81	1.20	1.33	.96	1.24	1.52	1.33	1.55	68,113,000	
West	4.87	2.62	2.89	1.54	3.36	3.26	2.15	1.61	37,878,000	
Northeast	2.06	1.37	1.49	.44	.93	1.24	.93	.16	49,461,000	
Middle Atlantic	2.22	1.42	1.65	.48	.91	1.25	.85	.03	37,263,000	
New York State	2.25	1.30	1.92	.68	.95	1.24	.83	-.12	18,122,400	(62)
Metropolitan Counties	2.67	1.58	2.14	.74	.98	1.27	.85	-.26	16,067,300	(31)
New York City	3.24	1.64	2.09	.73	.57	-.14	.14	-.81	7,567,900	(5)
New York Suburban ^a	3.47	1.94	4.97	1.81	2.82	5.44	2.37	.41	3,817,500	(5)
Metro Core excluding NYC	1.84	1.75	1.69	.39	1.17	1.68	.76	-.19	3,593,600	(9)
Metro Fringe excluding NYC Suburban	.44	.24	.47	.26	.96	1.46	1.56	1.07	1,088,300	(12)
Nonmetropolitan Counties	.29	-.27	.43	.27	.72	.93	.73	.99	2,055,100	(31)
Size of Largest Place greater than 10,000	.48	-.04	.56	.30	.80	1.14	.77	.97	1,454,900	(15)
Size of Largest Place less than 10,000	-.06	-.73	.14	.22	.53	.45	.63	1.03	600,200	(16)

Source:

U. S. Census of Population until 1970: 1975 estimates from Current Population Reports Series. P-25,
No. 619 for U. S. and No. 631 for New York State.

^aIncludes the counties of Nassau, Putnam, Rockland, Suffolk, and Westchester.

Table 2. Numbers of Net Migrants and Annual Rates of Net Migration for Categories of New York Counties, 1970-75.

	<u>1950-60</u>	<u>1960-70</u>	<u>1970-75</u> ^a	(Number of Counties)
<u>Net Migration</u> (Numbers in thousands)				
New York State	210	67	-537	(62)
<u>Metropolitan Counties</u>	<u>240</u>	<u>-49</u>	<u>-593</u>	<u>(31)</u>
New York City	-828	-497	-490	(5)
New York City Suburban Metro Counties	936	468	-8	(5)
Metro Core counties excluding New York City	105	-78	-120	(9)
Metro Fringe counties excluding NYC suburbs	26	58	25	(12)
<u>Nonmetropolitan Counties</u>	<u>-30</u>	<u>-18</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>(31)</u>
Size of Largest Place (SLP) greater than 10000	-1	-15	35	(15)
Size of Largest Place less than 10000	-28	-3	21	(16)
<u>Annual Rates of Net Migration</u>				
New York State	.13	-.04	-.56	(62)
<u>Metropolitan Counties</u>	<u>.17</u>	<u>-.03</u>	<u>-.70</u>	<u>(31)</u>
New York City	-1.06	-.63	-1.21	(5)
NYC Suburban	4.05	1.40	-.04	(5)
Metro Core excluding NYC	.34	-.22	-.63	(9)
Metro Fringe excluding NYC Suburbs	.32	.61	.45	(12)
<u>Nonmetropolitan Counties</u>	<u>-.17</u>	<u>-.10</u>	<u>-.53</u>	<u>(31)</u>
SLP greater than 10000	-.01	-.12	.48	(15)
SLP less than 10000	-.54	-.05	.67	(16)

^aCurrent Population Reports, P-25, No. 631.

Table 3. Annual Rates of Population Changes for New York State Nonmetropolitan Counties Categorized by Percent Commuting to SMSA.

Percent of Work Force Commuting to an SMSA in 1970	Annual Rates of Population Change			(Number of Counties)
	<u>1950-60</u>	<u>1960-70</u>	<u>1970-75</u> ^a	
Over 20 percent	.63	.68	1.08	(4)
11 to 20 percent	1.49	1.37	1.31	(8)
3 to 10 percent	.56	.53	.67	(13)
less than 3 percent	1.03	.27	1.05	(6)

^aCurrent Population Reports, P-25, No. 631.

Table 4. Comparisons of Mid-decade Population Estimates for Categories of New York Counties:
Annual Rates of Population Change

Area	Annual Rate of Population Change			
	1970-75 Provisional ^a	1970-75 Revenue Sharing ^b	1970-75 Revised ^c	1970-76 Provisional ^c
New York State	- .12	- .17	- .17	- .14
<u>Metropolitan Counties</u>	<u>- .26</u>	<u>- .32</u>	<u>- .32</u>	<u>- .28</u>
New York City	- .81	-1.03	-1.05	- .92
NYC suburban counties	.41	.60	.60	.59
Metro core counties excluding NYC	- .19	- .20	- .15	- .21
Metro fringe excluding NYC suburbs	1.07	1.07	1.05	.94
<u>Nonmetropolitan Counties</u>	<u>.99</u>	<u>1.01</u>	<u>1.02</u>	<u>1.01</u>
Size of Largest Place greater than 10000	.97	.95	.99	1.00
SLP less than 10000	1.03	1.15	1.11	1.05

Sources:

- a. Current Population Reports, P-25, No. 631.
- b. Current Population Reports, P-25, No. 680.
- c. Current Population Reports, P-26, No. 76-32.

Table 5. Annual Rates of Population Change by Size of Incorporated Place for Categories of Metropolitan New York Counties from 1960 to 1975.

<u>Metropolitan County Type</u>	<u>Size of Incorporated Place</u>	<u>1960-70</u>	<u>1970-75</u>	<u>Total 1975^a Population (in thousands)</u>
New York City		.14	-1.03	7,482
<u>New York City Suburban Counties</u>		<u>2.37</u>	<u>.60</u>	<u>3,856</u>
	Over 10,000	.78	-.50	965
	2500 to 10000	2.25	-.68	280
	Under 2500	2.15	.18	72
	Unincorporated	3.13	1.20	2,540
<u>Metro Core excluding NYC</u>		<u>.76</u>	<u>-.20</u>	<u>3,592</u>
	Over 10,000	-.92	-1.41	1,634
	2500 to 10,000	1.06	1.04	177
	Under 2500	.87	1.08	61
	Unincorporated	2.88	.85	1,720
<u>Metro Fringe Counties excluding NYC suburbs</u>		<u>1.56</u>	<u>1.07</u>	<u>1,088</u>
	Over 10,000	-.61	-.10	217
	2500 to 10,000	.10	.13	151
	Under 2500	1.21	1.35	80
	Unincorporated	2.99	1.68	640

^aCurrent Population Reports, P-25, No. 680.

Table 6. Annual Rates of Population Change by Size of Incorporated Place for Categories of Nonmetropolitan New York Counties from 1960 to 1975.

<u>Nonmetropolitan County Type</u>	<u>Size of Incorporated Place</u>	<u>1960-70</u>	<u>1970-75</u>	<u>Total 1975^a Population (in thousands)</u>
<u>Size of Largest Place in County greater than 10,000</u>		<u>.77</u>	<u>.95</u>	<u>1453</u>
	Over 10,000	-.57	-.06	436
	2500 to 10,000	.39	.58	114
	Under 2500	.33	.97	131
	Unincorporated	1.85	1.60	772
<u>Size of Largest Place less than 10,000</u>		<u>.63</u>	<u>1.15</u>	<u>604</u>
	Over 10,000	-	-	-
	2500 to 10,000	-.15	.52	140
	Under 2500	-.13	.67	80
	Unincorporated	1.13	1.49	384

^aCurrent Population Reports, P-25, No. 680.